

A PARADOX FROM RANDOMIZATION-BASED CAUSAL INFERENCE

BY PENG DING

Harvard University

Under the potential outcomes framework, causal effects are defined as comparisons between potential outcomes under treatment and control. Based on the treatment assignment mechanism in randomized experiments, Neyman and Fisher proposed two different approaches to testing the null hypothesis of zero average causal effect (Neyman’s null) and the null hypothesis of zero individual causal effect (Fisher’s null), respectively. Evidently, Fisher’s null implies Neyman’s null by logic. It is for this reason surprising that, in actual completely randomized experiments, rejection of Neyman’s null does not imply rejection of Fisher’s null for many realistic situations including the case with constant causal effect. Both numerical examples and asymptotic analyses support this surprising phenomenon. Although the connection between the Neymanian approach and the Wald test under a linear model has been established in the literature, we provide a new connection between the Fisher randomization test and Rao’s score test, which offers a new perspective on this paradox. Further, we show that this paradox also exists in other commonly-used experiments, such as stratified experiments, matched-pair experiments and factorial experiments.

1. Introduction. Since Neyman’s seminal work, the potential outcomes framework (Neyman, 1923; Rubin, 1974) is widely used for causal inference in randomized experiments (Neyman, 1935; Hinkelmann and Kempthorne, 2007). The potential outcomes framework permits us to make inference about a finite population of interest, with all potential outcomes fixed and randomness solely from the physical randomization. Historically, Neyman (1923) was interested in obtaining an unbiased estimator with a repeated sampling evaluation of the average causal effect, which also corresponded to a test for the null of zero average causal effect (Neyman’s null). On the other hand, Fisher (1935a) focused on testing the sharp null hypothesis of zero individual causal effect (Fisher’s null). Both Neymanian and Fisherian approaches are randomization-based inference, relying on the physical randomization of the experiments.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: 62A01, 62G20, 62K99

Keywords and phrases: Causal inference, Completely randomized experiment, Factorial experiment, Fisher randomization test, Matched-pair experiment, Potential outcome, Stratified experiment

Neyman’s null and Fisher’s null are closely related to each other: the latter implies the former, and they are equivalent under the constant causal effect assumption. Although both approaches have existed for quite a long time and are widely used in statistical practice, detailed comparisons of them have not been made.

Previous researchers (e.g., [Rosenbaum, 2002](#), page 40) believe that “in most cases, their disagreement is entirely without technical consequence: the same procedures are used, and the same conclusions are reached.” However, we demystify the subtle difference between them and show, via both numerical examples and theoretical investigations, that Neyman’s method tends to reject the null more often than Fisher’s method in many realistic randomized experiments. In fact, Neyman’s method is always more powerful if there is a nonzero constant treatment effect, the very alternative most used for Fisher-style inference. This finding immediately causes a seeming paradox: logically, Fisher’s null implies Neyman’s null, so how can we fail to reject the former while rejecting the latter?

These findings also extend to classical regression methods. Practitioners (e.g., [Angrist and Pischke, 2008](#)) find that regression-based causal inference in experiments has attractive properties, although such an approach has been criticized by [Freedman \(2008\)](#). It is known ([Schochet, 2010](#); [Samii and Aronow, 2012](#); [Lin, 2013](#)) that, although ordinary least squares (OLS) gives an unbiased estimator for the average causal effect, the conventional variance estimator is generally wrong unless the Huber-White heteroskedasticity robust variance estimator ([Huber, 1967](#); [White, 1980](#)) is used. This result establishes a connection between Neymanian inference and the Wald test for a linear model, and we further make a new connection between the Fisher randomization test (FRT) and Rao’s score test for the corresponding linear model. Based on the comparison of Neymanian and Fisherian methods, we find that Rao’s score test is less powerful than the Wald test, although Rao’s score test is shown to be locally most powerful ([Davison, 2003](#)).

This new connection above motivates us to investigate the behaviors of Neymanian and Fisherian tests under different types of alternative hypotheses: they are asymptotically equivalent under local alternative hypotheses with shrinking constant effects, but Neymanian tests tend to be more powerful under alternatives with fixed constant effects.

Further, we demonstrate that this surprising paradox is not unique to completely random-

ized experiments, since it also exists in other commonly-used experiments such as stratified experiments, matched-pair experiments and factorial experiments. The result for factorial experiments helps to explain the surprising empirical evidence in [Dasgupta et al. \(2012\)](#) that interval estimators for factorial effects obtained by inverting a sequence of FRTs are often wider than Neymanian confidence intervals.

The paper proceeds as follows. We review Neymanian and Fisherian randomization-based causal inference in Section 2 under the potential outcomes framework. In Section 3, we use both numerical examples and asymptotic analyses to demonstrate the paradox from randomization-based inference in completely randomized experiments. We further establish the connections between randomization-based and regression-based inferences in experiments, and offer a new view of the paradox in Section 4. Section 5 shows that a similar paradox also exists in other commonly-used experiments. Section 6 extends the scope of the paper to variance and interval estimations. We conclude with a discussion in Section 7, and present all the technical details in the Appendix.

2. Completely Randomized Experiments and Randomization Inference. We first introduce notation for causal inference in completely randomized experiments, and then review Neymanian and Fisherian perspectives for causal inference.

2.1. Completely Randomized Experiments and Potential Outcomes. Consider N units in a completely randomized experiment. Throughout our discussion, we make the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA; [Rubin, 1980](#)), i.e., there is only one version of the treatment, and interference between subjects is absent. Then we can define the potential outcome of unit i under treatment t as $Y_i(t)$, with $t = 1$ for treatment and $t = 0$ for control. The individual causal effect is defined as a comparison between two potential outcomes, for example, $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$. However, for each subject i , we can observe only one of $Y_i(1)$ and $Y_i(0)$ with the other one missing, and the individual causal effect τ_i is not observable. The observed outcome is a function of the treatment assignment T_i and the potential outcomes, namely, $Y_i^{obs} = T_i Y_i(1) + (1 - T_i) Y_i(0)$. Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_N)'$ denote the treatment assignment vector, and $\mathbf{Y}^{obs} = (Y_1^{obs}, \dots, Y_N^{obs})'$ denote the observed outcome vector. Completely randomized experiments satisfy $\text{pr}(\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{t}) = N_1!N_0!/N!$, where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_N)' \in \{0, 1\}^N$

with $\sum_{i=1}^N t_i = N_1$ and $N_0 = N - N_1$.

2.2. *Neymanian Inference for the Average Causal Effect.* [Neyman \(1923\)](#) was interested in estimating the finite population average causal effect:

$$\tau = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tau_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\} = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0,$$

where $\bar{Y}_t = \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(t)/N$ is the finite population average of the potential outcomes $\{Y_i(t) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. He proposed an unbiased estimator

$$(2.1) \quad \hat{\tau} = \bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}_0^{obs}$$

for τ , where $\bar{Y}_t^{obs} = \sum_{\{i: T_i=t\}} Y_i^{obs}/N_t$ is the sample mean of the observed outcomes under treatment t . The sampling variance of $\hat{\tau}$ over all possible randomizations is

$$(2.2) \quad \text{var}(\hat{\tau}) = \frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_0^2}{N_0} - \frac{S_\tau^2}{N},$$

depending on $S_t^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \{Y_i(t) - \bar{Y}_t\}^2 / (N - 1)$, the finite population variance of the potential outcomes $\{Y_i(t) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$, and $S_\tau^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (\tau_i - \tau)^2 / (N - 1)$, the finite population variance of the individual causal effects $\{\tau_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Since we can never jointly observe the pair of potential outcomes for each unit, the variance of $\{\tau_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ is not identifiable from the observed data. Recognizing this difficulty, [Neyman \(1923\)](#) suggested

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = \frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_0^2}{N_0},$$

as an estimator for $\text{var}(\hat{\tau})$, where $s_t^2 = \sum_{\{i: T_i=t\}} (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_t^{obs})^2 / (N_t - 1)$ is the sample variance of the observed outcomes under treatment t . However, Neyman's variance estimator $\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})$ overestimates the true variance $\text{var}(\hat{\tau})$, in the sense that $E\{\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})\} \geq \text{var}(\hat{\tau})$, with equality holding if and only if the individual causal effects are constant: $\tau_i = \tau$ or $S_\tau^2 = 0$. The randomization distribution of $\hat{\tau}$ enables us to test the following Neyman's null hypothesis:

$$H_0(\text{Neyman}) : \tau = 0.$$

Under $H_0(\text{Neyman})$ and based on the Normal approximation in Section 3.3, the p -value from Neyman's approach can be approximated by

$$(2.4) \quad p(\text{Neyman}) \approx 2\Phi \left\{ -\frac{|\hat{\tau}^{obs}|}{\sqrt{\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})}} \right\},$$

where $\hat{\tau}^{obs}$ is the realized value of $\hat{\tau}$, and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard Normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. When we have non-constant individual causal effects, Neyman’s test for null average causal effect tends to be “conservative”, in the sense that it rejects less often than the nominal significance level.

2.3. Fisherian Randomization Test for the Sharp Null. Fisher (1935a) was interested in testing the following sharp null hypothesis:

$$H_0(\text{Fisher}) : Y_i(1) = Y_i(0), \forall i = 1, \dots, N.$$

This null hypothesis is sharp because all missing potential outcomes can be imputed under $H_0(\text{Fisher})$. The sharp null hypothesis implies that $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) = Y_i^{obs}$ are all fixed constants, so that the observed outcome for subject i is Y_i^{obs} under any treatment assignment. Although we can perform randomization tests using any test statistics capturing the deviation from the null, we will discuss the randomization test using $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) = \hat{\tau}$ as the test statistic to compare with Neyman’s method. Although $\hat{\tau}$ in (2.1) has exactly the same form as $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ above, the latter more perplexing notation will make the later description of the FRT clearer. Again, the randomness of $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ comes solely from the randomization of the treatment assignment $\mathbf{T}$, since $\mathbf{Y}^{obs}$ is a set of constants under the sharp null. The p -value under the sharp null is

$$p(\text{Fisher}) = \text{pr} \left\{ |\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})| \geq |\hat{\tau}^{obs}| \mid H_0(\text{Fisher}) \right\},$$

measuring the extremeness of $\hat{\tau}^{obs}$ with respect to the null distribution of $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ over all possible randomizations. In practice, we can approximate the distribution of $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ by Monte Carlo. We draw, repeatedly and independently, completely randomized treatment assignment vectors $\{\mathbf{T}^1, \dots, \mathbf{T}^M\}$, and with large M the p -value can be well approximated by

$$p(\text{Fisher}) \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M I \left\{ |\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}^m, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})| \geq |\hat{\tau}^{obs}| \right\}.$$

More discussion about randomization tests can also be found in Rosenbaum (2002).

3. A Paradox from Neymanian and Fisherian Inference. Neymanian and Fisherian approaches reviewed in Section 2 share some common essence but also differ fundamentally. They both rely on the distribution induced by the physical randomization, but they

test two different null hypotheses and rely on different statistical philosophies. In this section, we first compare Neymanian and Fisherian approaches via simple numerical examples, and highlight a surprising paradox. We then explain the paradox via asymptotic analysis.

3.1. Initial Numerical Comparisons. We compare Neymanian and Fisherian approaches using numerical examples with both balanced and unbalanced experiments. In our simulations, the potential outcomes are fixed, the simulations are carried out over randomization distributions induced by the treatment assignments, the significance level is 0.05, and $M = 10^5$ for the FRT.

EXAMPLE 1 (Balanced Experiments with $N_1 = N_0$). The potential outcomes are independently generated from Normal distributions $Y_i(1) \sim N(1/10, 1/16)$ and $Y_i(0) \sim N(0, 1/16)$, for $i = 1, \dots, 100$. Further, they are fixed once drawn from the Normal distributions above. We repeatedly generate 1000 completely randomized treatment assignments with $N = 100$ and $N_1 = N_0 = 50$. For each treatment assignment, we obtain the observed outcomes and implement two tests for Neyman's null and Fisher's null. As shown in Table 1(a), it never happens that we reject Fisher's null but fail to reject Neyman's null. However, we reject Neyman's null but fail to reject Fisher's null in 15 instances.

EXAMPLE 2 (Unbalanced Experiments with $N_1 \neq N_0$). The potential outcomes are independently generated from Normal distributions $Y_i(1) \sim N(1/10, 1/4)$ and $Y_i(0) \sim N(0, 1/16)$, for $i = 1, \dots, 100$. They are kept as fixed throughout the simulations. The unequal variances are designed on purpose, and we will reveal the reason for choosing them later in Example 3 of Section 3.4. We repeatedly generate 1000 completely randomized treatment assignments with $N = 100$, $N_1 = 70$, and $N_0 = 30$. After obtaining each observed data set, we perform two hypothesis testing procedures. The pattern in Table 1(b) is more striking than in Table 1(a), since it happens 62 times in Table 1(b) that we reject Neyman's null but fail to reject Fisher's null. For this particular set of potential outcomes, Neyman's testing procedure has a power $62/1000 = 0.062$ slightly larger than 0.05, but Fisher's testing procedure has a power $8/1000 = 0.008$ much smaller than 0.05 even though the sharp null is not true. We will explain in Section 3.4 the reason why the FRT could have a power even smaller than the significance level under some alternative hypotheses.

TABLE 1
Numerical Examples. The notation “ $\neg$ ” means “rejection” of the hypotheses.

(a) Balanced experiments			(b) Unbalanced experiments		
	$H_0(\text{Fisher})$	$\neg H_0(\text{Fisher})$		$H_0(\text{Fisher})$	$\neg H_0(\text{Fisher})$
$H_0(\text{Neyman})$	488	0	$H_0(\text{Neyman})$	930	0
$\neg H_0(\text{Neyman})$	15	497	$\neg H_0(\text{Neyman})$	62	8

3.2. *Statistical Inference, Logic, and Paradox.* Logically, Fisher’s null implies Neyman’s null. Therefore, Fisher’s null should be rejected if Neyman’s null is rejected. However, this is not always true from the results of statistical inference in completely randomized experiments. We observed in our numerical examples above that it can be the case that

$$(3.1) \quad p(\text{Neyman}) < \alpha_0 < p(\text{Fisher}),$$

in which we should reject Neyman’s null, but fail to reject Fisher’s null, if we choose the significance level to be α_0 (e.g., $\alpha_0 = 0.05$). When (3.1) holds, an awkward logical problem appears as illustrated in Figure 1. In the remaining part of this section, we will theoretically explain the empirical findings in Section 3.1 and the logical problem in Figure 1.

Logic:	$H_0(\text{Fisher})$	$\implies$	$H_0(\text{Neyman})$
Logic:	$\neg H_0(\text{Fisher})$	$\impliedby$	$\neg H_0(\text{Neyman})$
Statistical inference:	Accept $H_0(\text{Fisher})$	but	reject $H_0(\text{Neyman})$

FIG 1. *A paradox from randomization inference. “ $\neg$ ” means the negation or rejection of a hypothesis.*

3.3. *Asymptotic Evaluations.* While Neyman’s testing procedure has an explicit form, the FRT is typically done by Monte Carlo. In order to compare them, we first discuss the asymptotic Normalities of $\hat{\tau}$ and the randomization test statistic $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$. We provide a simplified way of doing variance calculation and a short proof for asymptotic Normalities of both $\hat{\tau}$ and $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$, based on the finite population Central Limit Theorem (CLT; Hajek, 1960; Lehmann, 1998; Freedman, 2008). Before the formal asymptotic results, it is worth mentioning the exact meaning of “asymptotics” in the context of finite population causal inference. We need to embed the finite population of interest into a hypothetical infinite sequence of finite populations with increasing sizes, and also require the proportions of the treatment units to converge to a fixed value. Essentially, all the population quantities (e.g., τ , S_1^2 , etc.) should

have the index N , and all the sample quantities (e.g., $\hat{\tau}$, s_1^2 , etc.) should have double indices N and N_1 . However, for the purpose of simplicity, we sacrifice a little bit of mathematical precision and drop all the indices in our discussion.

THEOREM 1. As $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\tau} - \tau}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\tau})}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

In practice, the true variance $\text{var}(\hat{\tau})$ is replaced by its “conservative” estimator $\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})$, and the resulting test rejects less often than the nominal significance level on average. While the asymptotics for the Neymanian unbiased estimator $\hat{\tau}$ does not depend on the null hypothesis, the following asymptotic Normality for $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ is true only under the sharp null.

THEOREM 2. Under $H_0(\text{Fisher})$ and as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})}{\sqrt{\hat{V}(\text{Fisher})}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) = Ns^2/(N_1N_0)$, $s^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2/(N-1)$, and $\bar{Y}^{obs} = \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{obs}/N$.

Therefore, the p -value under $H_0(\text{Fisher})$ can be approximated by

$$(3.2) \quad p(\text{Fisher}) \approx 2\Phi \left\{ -\frac{|\hat{\tau}^{obs}|}{\sqrt{\hat{V}(\text{Fisher})}} \right\}.$$

From (2.4) and (3.2), the asymptotic p -values obtained from Neymanian and Fisherian approaches differ only due to the difference between the variances $\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})$ and $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher})$. Therefore, a comparison of the variances will explain the different behaviors of the corresponding approaches. In the following, we use the conventional notation $R_N = o_p(N^{-1})$ for a random quantity satisfying $N \cdot R_N \rightarrow 0$ in probability as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (Lehmann, 1998).

THEOREM 3. Asymptotically, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) \\ &= (N_0^{-1} - N_1^{-1})(S_1^2 - S_0^2) + N^{-1}(\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0)^2 + o_p(N^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The difference between the variance estimators depends on the ratio between the treatment and control sample sizes, and differences between the means and variances of the treatment and control potential outcomes.

3.4. *Theoretical Comparison.* Although quite straightforward, Theorem 3 has several helpful implications to explain the paradoxical results in Section 3.1.

Under $H_0(\text{Fisher})$, $\bar{Y}_1 = \bar{Y}_0$, $S_1^2 = S_0^2$, and the difference between the two variances is of higher order, namely, $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = o_p(N^{-1})$. Therefore, Neymanian and Fisherian methods coincide with each other asymptotically under the sharp null. This is the basic requirement, since both testing procedures should generate correct type I errors under this circumstance. We divide the rest of the discussion into two parts corresponding to balanced and unbalanced experiments.

For balanced experiments with $N_1 = N_0$, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = N^{-1}(\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0)^2 + o_p(N^{-1}).$$

Under $H_0(\text{Neyman})$, $\bar{Y}_1 = \bar{Y}_0$, and the difference between the two variances is of higher order, and two tests have the same asymptotic performance. However, under the alternative hypothesis, $\tau = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0 \neq 0$, and the difference above is positive for large N , and we will reject Neyman's null hypothesis more often than Fisher's null hypothesis.

For unbalanced experiments, the difference between two variances can be either positive or negative. If $S_1^2 = S_0^2$ (e.g., under constant causal effect), the difference is of higher order term under Neyman's null, leading to asymptotically equivalent tests; and it is positive if Neyman's null does not hold, making Neyman's test more powerful. In practice, if we have prior knowledge $S_1^2 > S_0^2$, unbalanced experiments with $N_1 > N_0$ are preferable to improve estimation precision. In this case, we have $(N_0^{-1} - N_1^{-1})(S_1^2 - S_0^2) > 0$ and $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) > \hat{V}(\text{Neyman})$ for large N . Surprisingly, we are more likely to reject Neyman's null than Fisher's null, although Neyman's test itself is conservative with nonconstant causal effect implied by $S_1^2 > S_0^2$. We consider the following interesting case with $\bar{Y}_1 = \bar{Y}_0$, $S_1^2 > S_0^2$ and $N_1 > N_0$. Even though $H_0(\text{Neyman})$ holds but $H_0(\text{Fisher})$ does not, the rejection rate of Fisher's test is smaller than Neyman's test. Consequently, the difference-in-means statistic $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ has no power against the sharp null, and the resulting FRT rejects even less often than the nominal significance level.

In summary, Neymanian and Fisherian approaches have different performances in general, unless the sharp null hypothesis holds. Although Fisher's sharp null imposes more restrictions on the potential outcomes, the resulting randomization test tends to overestimate the true

variability under the alternative hypothesis. Consequently, the variance of the randomization test statistic is larger than Neyman's estimated sampling variance of the unbiased estimator in many realistic cases. Paradoxically, randomization-based statistical hypothesis testings, in many situations, tend to reject Neyman's null more often than Fisher's null, which contradicts the logical fact that Fisher's null implies Neyman's null.

In order to verify the asymptotic theory above, we go back to compare the variances in the previous numerical examples.

EXAMPLE 3 (Continuations of Examples 1 and 2). We plot in Figure 2 the variances $\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})$ and $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher})$ obtained from the numerical examples in Section 3.1. In both the left and the right panels, $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher})$ tends to be larger than $\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})$. This pattern is more striking on the right panel with unbalanced experiments designed to satisfy $(N_0^{-1} - N_1^{-1})(S_1^2 - S_0^2) > 0$. It is thus not very surprising that the FRT is much less powerful than Neyman's test, and it rejects even less often than nominal 0.05 level as shown in Table 1(b).




FIG 2. Variances in balanced and unbalanced experiments

3.5. Binary Outcomes. We close this section by investigating the special case with binary outcomes. Let $p_t = \bar{Y}(t)$ be the potential proportion and $\hat{p}_t = \bar{Y}_t^{obs}$ be the sample proportion of

one under treatment t . Define $\hat{p} = \bar{Y}^{obs}$ as the proportion of one in all the observed outcomes. The results in the following corollary are special cases of Theorems 1 to 3.

COROLLARY 1. Neyman’s test is asymptotically equivalent to the “unpooled” test

$$\frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_0}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1)/N_1 + \hat{p}_0(1 - \hat{p}_0)/N_0}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

under H_0 (Neyman); and Fisher’s test is asymptotically equivalent to the “pooled” test

$$\frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_0}{\sqrt{\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})(N_1^{-1} + N_0^{-1})}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

under H_0 (Fisher). The asymptotic difference between the two tests is due to

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) \\ (3.5) \quad &= (N_0^{-1} - N_1^{-1})\{p_1(1 - p_1) - p_0(1 - p_0)\} + N^{-1}(p_1 - p_0)^2 + o_p(N^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

For the case with binary outcomes, we can draw analogous but slightly different conclusions. Under Neyman’s null, $p_1 = p_0$ and the two tests are asymptotically equivalent. In balanced experiments, Neyman’s test is always more powerful than Fisher’s test under the alternative with $p_1 \neq p_0$. For unbalanced experiments, the answer is not definite, but Equation (3.5) allows us to determine the region of (p_1, p_0) that favors Neyman’s test for a given level of the ratio N_1/N_0 .

The two tests in Corollary 1 are based purely on randomization inference, which have the same mathematical forms as the classical “unpooled” and “pooled” tests for equal proportions under two independent Binomial models. Our conclusion is coherent with Robbins (1977) that the “unpooled” test is more powerful than the “pooled” one with equal sample size, and Equation (3.5) immediately leads to the conclusions in Eberhardt and Fligner (1977).

4. Connections with Regression-Based Causal Inference. In current statistical practice, it is also very popular among applied researchers to use regression-based methods to analyze experimental data (Angrist and Pischke, 2008). Assume the following linear model for the observed outcomes:

$$(4.1) \quad Y_i^{obs} = \alpha + \beta T_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

where $\varepsilon_i, \dots, \varepsilon_N$ are independently and identically distributed (iid) as $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. The hypothesis of zero treatment effect is thus characterized by $H_0(LM) : \beta = 0$.

[Hinkelmann and Kempthorne \(2007\)](#) called

$$Y_i^{obs} = T_i Y_i(1) + (1 - T_i) Y_i(0) = Y_i(0) + \{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\} T_i = \alpha + \beta T_i + \varepsilon_i$$

the “derived linear model”, assuming that $Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = \beta$ is a constant and $Y_i(0) = \alpha + \varepsilon_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. But the linear model for observed outcomes ignores the design of the randomized experiment, and the “iid” assumption contradicts $\text{cov}(T_i, T_j) \neq 0$ and $\text{cov}(Y_i^{obs}, Y_j^{obs}) \neq 0$ for $i \neq j$. Although linear regression has been criticized for analyzing experimental data ([Freedman, 2008](#)), the least square estimator $\hat{\beta}_{OLS} = \hat{\tau}$ is unbiased for the average causal effect τ . However, the correct variance of $\hat{\beta}_{OLS}$ requires careful discussion.

4.1. Heteroskedasticity-Robust Wald Test versus Neymanian Inference. The residual is defined as $\hat{\varepsilon}_i = Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_1$ if $T_i = 1$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_i = Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_0$ if $T_i = 0$. Since the variance σ^2 in the linear model can be estimated by

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{N-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_i^2 = \frac{N_1-1}{N-2} s_1^2 + \frac{N_0-1}{N-2} s_0^2,$$

the variance of $\hat{\beta}_{OLS}$, $\text{var}(\hat{\beta}_{OLS}) = N\sigma^2/(N_1 N_0)$, can be estimated by

$$\hat{V}_{OLS} = \frac{N(N_1-1)}{(N-2)N_1 N_0} s_1^2 + \frac{N(N_0-1)}{(N-2)N_1 N_0} s_0^2 \approx \frac{s_1^2}{N_0} + \frac{s_0^2}{N_1}.$$

It is different from Neyman’s variance estimator in (2.3) unless $N_1 = N_0$. [Schochet \(2010\)](#), [Samii and Aronow \(2012\)](#) and [Lin \(2013\)](#) pointed out that we can avoid this problem by using Huber-White heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator ([Huber, 1967](#); [White, 1980](#)):

$$\hat{V}_{HW} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_i^2 (T_i - \bar{T})^2}{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N (T_i - \bar{T})^2 \right\}^2} = \frac{s_1^2}{N_1} \frac{N_1-1}{N_1} + \frac{s_0^2}{N_0} \frac{N_0-1}{N_0} \approx \frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_0^2}{N_0},$$

which is asymptotically equivalent to (2.3). Therefore, the Wald statistic using $\hat{V}_{HW}$ for testing $H_0(LM)$ is asymptotically the same as the Neymanian test.

4.2. Rao’s Score Test versus the FRT. While the comparison between the behavior of the Wald test for $H_0(LM)$ and Neyman’s test has been established in previous studies, we make a similar comparison between Rao’s score test for $H_0(LM)$ and the FRT in the following theorem.

THEOREM 4. Rao's score test under model (4.1) is equivalent to

$$S = \frac{\hat{\tau}}{\sqrt{\hat{V}_S}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\hat{V}_S = (N - 1)s^2/(N_1N_0)$.

Ignoring the difference between $(N - 1)$ and N when N is large, the difference between $\hat{V}_S$ and $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher})$ is of higher order, and Rao's score test is asymptotically equivalent to the FRT. The sharp null hypothesis imposes the equal variance assumption on potential outcomes under treatment and control, leading to the equivalence of Rao's score test under the homoskedastic model and the FRT.

4.3. Locally Most Powerful Test. We discussed in Section 3.4 that Neyman's test is more powerful than Fisher's test, or equivalently, the Wald test is more powerful than Rao's score test, asymptotically. This finding causes a small paradox: although Rao's score test is shown to be a locally most powerful test (Davison, 2003) under local alternative hypotheses, it is less powerful than the Wald test under the alternative hypothesis with β being a constant.

The new connection motivates us to discuss randomization-based inference under constant causal effect. The constant causal effect assumption implies $\tau_i = \tau$, $S_1^2 = S_0^2$, and further

$$\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = \tau^2/N + o_p(N^{-1}).$$

When $\tau \neq 0$ is a constant, the above equation implies that FRT is always less powerful than Neyman's test for a sequence of alternative hypotheses with constant causal effects. However, if we choose a special sequence of local alternative hypotheses with constant causal effects $\tau_i = c/\sqrt{N}$ for some fixed c , we have that

$$\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = c^2/N^2 + o_p(N^{-1}) = o_p(N^{-1}),$$

which is a negligible higher order term. Therefore, Neymanian and Fisherian inference have the same asymptotic behaviors under this sequence of local alternatives.

5. Ubiquity of the Paradox in More Complicated Experiments. The paradox discussed in Section 3 is not unique to completely randomized experiments. As a direct generalization of the previous results, the paradox will appear in each stratum of stratified experiments. We will also show its existence in two other widely-used experiments: matched-pair

designs and factorial designs. In order to minimize confusion about the notation, each of the following two subsections are self-contained.

5.1. Matched-Pair Experiments. Consider a matched-pair experiment with $2N$ units and N pairs matched according to their observed characteristics. Within each matched pair, we randomly select one unit to receive treatment and the other to receive control. Let T_i be iid Bernoulli(1/2) for $i = 1, \dots, N$, indicating treatment assignments for the matched pairs. For pair i , the first unit receives treatment and the second unit receives control if $T_i = 1$; and otherwise if $T_i = 0$. Under the SUTVA, we define $(Y_{ij}(1), Y_{ij}(0))$ as the potential outcomes of the j th unit in the i th pair under treatment and control, and the observed outcomes within pair i are $Y_{i1}^{obs} = T_i Y_{i1}(1) + (1 - T_i) Y_{i1}(0)$ and $Y_{i2}^{obs} = T_i Y_{i2}(0) + (1 - T_i) Y_{i2}(1)$. Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_N)'$ and $\mathbf{Y}^{obs} = \{Y_{ij}^{obs} : i = 1, \dots, N; j = 1, 2\}$ denote the $N \times 1$ treatment assignment vector and the $N \times 2$ observed outcome matrix, respectively. Within pair i , $\hat{\tau}_i = T_i(Y_{i1}^{obs} - Y_{i2}^{obs}) + (1 - T_i)(Y_{i2}^{obs} - Y_{i1}^{obs})$ is unbiased for the within-pair average causal effect $\tau_i = \{Y_{i1}(1) + Y_{i2}(1) - Y_{i1}(0) - Y_{i2}(0)\}/2$. Immediately, we can use

$$\hat{\tau} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\tau}_i$$

as an unbiased estimator for the finite population average causal effect

$$\tau = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tau_i = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^2 \{Y_{ij}(1) - Y_{ij}(0)\}.$$

[Imai \(2008\)](#) discussed Neymanian inference for τ and identified the variance of $\hat{\tau}$ with the corresponding variance estimator. To be more specific, he found that

$$\text{var}(\hat{\tau}) = \frac{1}{4N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{Y_{i1}(1) + Y_{i1}(0) - Y_{i2}(1) - Y_{i2}(0)\}^2,$$

which can be “conservatively” estimated by

$$\hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\tau}_i - \hat{\tau})^2.$$

The repeated sampling evaluation above allows us to test Neyman’s null average causal effect:

$$H_0(\text{Neyman}) : \tau = 0.$$

On the other hand, [Rosenbaum \(2002\)](#) discussed intensively the FRT in matched-pair experiments under the sharp null hypothesis:

$$H_0(\text{Fisher}) : Y_{ij}(1) = Y_{ij}(0), \forall i = 1, \dots, N; \forall j = 1, 2,$$

which is, again, much stronger than Neyman's null. For the purpose of comparison, we choose the test statistic with the same form as $\hat{\tau}$, denoted as $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$. In practice, the null distribution of this test statistic can be calculated exactly by enumerating all the 2^N randomizations or approximated by Monte Carlo. For our theoretical investigation, we obtain $E\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = 0$ and

$$\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) = \text{var}\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\tau}_i^2.$$

Since the treatment assignments T_i 's are iid Bernoulli(1/2), we can establish asymptotic Normalities for both Neymanian and Fisherian inferences by applying the Lindberg-Feller CLT, resulting in asymptotic p -values with the same forms as (2.4) and (3.2). Therefore, the asymptotic difference between Neymanian and Fisherian approaches is again due to the difference between $\hat{V}(\text{Neyman})$ and $\hat{V}(\text{Fisher})$. Simple algebra allows us to identify

$$\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = \frac{\tau^2}{N} + o_p(N^{-1}).$$

Under $H_0(\text{Neyman})$, the difference is a higher order term, leading to asymptotically equivalent behaviors of Neymanian and Fisherian inferences. However, under the alternative hypothesis with nonzero τ , the same paradox appears again in matched-pair experiments: we tend to reject Neyman's null more often than Fisher's null.

5.2. Factorial Experiments. Fisher (1935a) and Yates (1937) developed the classic factorial experiments in the context of agricultural experiments, and Wu and Hamada (2009) provided a comprehensive modern discussion of design and analysis of factorial experiments. Although rooted in randomization theory (Kempthorne, 1955; Hinkelmann and Kempthorne, 2007), the analysis of factorial experiments is dominated by linear and generalized linear models, with factorial effects often defined as model parameters. Realizing the inherent drawbacks of the predominant approaches, Dasgupta et al. (2012) discussed the causal inference from 2^K factorial experiments using the potential outcomes framework, which allows for defining the causal estimands based on potential outcomes instead of model parameters.

We first briefly review the notation for factorial experiments adopted by Dasgupta et al. (2012). Assume that we have K factors with levels $+1$ and -1 . Let $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_K)' \in \mathcal{F}_K = \{+1, -1\}^K$, a K -dimensional vector, denote a particular treatment combination. The

number of possible values of $\mathbf{z}$ is $J = 2^K$, for each of which we can define $Y_i(\mathbf{z})$ as the corresponding potential outcome for unit i under the SUTVA. We use a J -dimensional vector $\mathbf{Y}_i$ to denote all potential outcomes for unit i , where $i = 1, \dots, N = r \times 2^K$ with an integer r representing the number of replications of each treatment combination. Without loss of generality, we will discuss the inference of the main factorial effect of factor 1, and analogous discussion also holds for general factorial effects due to symmetry. The main factorial effect of factor 1 can be characterized by a vector $\mathbf{g}_1$ of dimension J , with one half of its elements being $+1$ and the other half being -1 . Specifically, the element of $\mathbf{g}_1$ is $+1$ if the corresponding z_1 is $+1$, and -1 otherwise. For example, in 2^2 experiments, we have $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_i(+1, +1), Y_i(+1, -1), Y_i(-1, +1), Y_i(-1, -1))'$ and $\mathbf{g}_1 = (+1, +1, -1, -1)'$. We define $\tau_{i1} = 2^{-(K-1)} \mathbf{g}_1' \mathbf{Y}_i$ as the main factorial effect of factor 1 for unit i , and

$$\tau_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tau_{i1} = 2^{-(K-1)} \mathbf{g}_1' \bar{\mathbf{Y}}$$

as the average main factorial effect of the factor 1, where $\bar{\mathbf{Y}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Y}_i / N$.

For factorial experiments, we define the treatment assignment as $W_i(\mathbf{z})$, with $W_i(\mathbf{z}) = 1$ if the i th unit is assigned to $\mathbf{z}$, and 0 otherwise. Therefore, we use $\mathbf{W}_i = \{W_i(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K\}$ as the treatment assignment vector for unit i , and let $\mathbf{W}$ be the collection of all the unit-level treatment assignments. The observed outcomes are deterministic functions of the potential outcomes and the treatment assignment, namely, $Y_i^{obs} = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} W_i(\mathbf{z}) Y_i(\mathbf{z})$ for unit i , and $\mathbf{Y}^{obs} = (Y_1^{obs}, \dots, Y_N^{obs})'$ for all the observed outcomes. Since

$$\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\{i: W_i(\mathbf{z})=1\}} Y_i^{obs} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(\mathbf{z}) Y_i(\mathbf{z})$$

is unbiased for $\bar{Y}(\mathbf{z})$, we can unbiasedly estimate τ_1 by

$$\hat{\tau}_1 = 2^{-(K-1)} \mathbf{g}_1' \bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{obs},$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{obs}$ is the J -dimensional vector for the average observed outcomes. [Dasgupta et al. \(2012\)](#) showed that the sampling variance of $\hat{\tau}_1$ is

$$(5.1) \quad \text{var}(\hat{\tau}_1) = \frac{1}{2^{2(K-1)} r} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} S^2(\mathbf{z}) - \frac{1}{N} S_1^2,$$

where $S^2(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \{Y_i(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}(\mathbf{z})\}^2 / (N-1)$ is the finite population variance of the potential outcomes under treatment combination $\mathbf{z}$, and $S_1^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (\tau_{i1} - \tau_1)^2 / (N-1)$ is the finite

population variance of the unit level factorial effects $\{\tau_{i1} : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Similar to the discussion in completely randomized experiments, the last term S_1^2 in (5.1) cannot be identified, and consequently the variance in (5.1) can only be “conservatively” estimated by

$$\hat{V}_1(\text{Neyman}) = \frac{1}{2^{2(K-1)}r} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} s^2(\mathbf{z}),$$

where the sample variance of outcomes $s^2(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\{i: W_i(\mathbf{z})=1\}} \{Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z})\}^2 / (r-1)$ under treatment combination $\mathbf{z}$ is unbiased for $S^2(\mathbf{z})$. The discussion above allows us to construct a Wald-type test for the following Neyman’s null of zero average factorial effect for factor 1:

$$H_0^1(\text{Neyman}) : \tau_1 = 0.$$

On the other hand, based on the physical act of randomization in factorial experiments, the FRT allows us to test the following sharp null hypothesis:

$$(5.2) \quad H_0(\text{Fisher}) : Y_i(\mathbf{z}) = Y_i^{obs}, \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K, \forall i = 1, \dots, N.$$

This sharp null restricts all factorial effects for all the individuals to be zero, which is much stronger than $H_0^1(\text{Neyman})$. For a fair comparison, we use the same test statistic as $\hat{\tau}_1$ in our randomization test, and denote $\hat{\tau}_1(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ as a function of the treatment assignment and observed outcomes. Under the sharp null (5.2), the randomness of $\hat{\tau}_1(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ is induced by randomization, and the following theorem gives us its mean and variance.

THEOREM 5. We have $E\{\hat{\tau}_1(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = 0$ and

$$\hat{V}_1(\text{Fisher}) \equiv \text{var}\{\hat{\tau}_1(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = \frac{1}{2^{2(K-1)}r} J s^2,$$

where $\bar{Y}^{obs} = \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{obs} / N$ and $s^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 / (N-1)$ are the sample mean and variance of all the observed outcomes.

Based on Normal approximations, comparison of the p -values reduces to the difference between $\hat{V}_1(\text{Neyman})$ and $\hat{V}_1(\text{Fisher})$, shown in the theorem below.

THEOREM 6. With large r , the difference between $\hat{V}_1(\text{Neyman})$ and $\hat{V}_1(\text{Fisher})$ is

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \hat{V}_1(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}_1(\text{Neyman}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{3K-1}r} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \sum_{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}(\mathbf{z}')\}^2 + o_p(r^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

As a sanity check, formula (3.4) is a special case of formula (5.3) with $K = 1$ and $r = N_1 = N_0 = N/2$, since complete randomized experiments are special cases of factorial experiments with a single factor. Therefore, in factorial experiments with the same replicates r at each level, the paradox always exists under alternative hypothesis with nonzero τ_1 , just as in balanced completely randomized experiments.

6. Extensions on Variance and Interval Estimations. The previous sections mainly discuss the randomization-based tests for two different null hypotheses, and a consequent paradox arising from Neymanian and Fisherian inference. However, practitioners are also interested in interval estimation of the causal effect. In this section, we will discuss some further issues about variance and interval estimations, and make connections with our previous discussion about hypothesis testing in completely randomized experiments.

6.1. Further Improvement of the Neymanian Variance Estimator. We show in Section 4.1 that a carefully-designed Huber-White variance estimator can recover the result of Neymanian randomization-based inference in completely randomized experiments. Moreover, further improvements over the variance estimator is possible under the potential outcomes framework. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies $S_\tau^2 = S_1^2 + S_0^2 - 2S_{10} \geq S_1^2 + S_0^2 - 2S_1S_0 = (S_1 - S_0)^2$, and thus the lower bound of the variance in (2.2) is

$$\text{var}(\hat{\tau}) \leq \frac{N_0}{N_1N} S_1^2 + \frac{N_1}{N_0N} S_0^2 + \frac{2S_1S_0}{N},$$

with the equality attainable if $Y_i(1)$ is a linear function of $Y_i(0)$ (more general than the constant treatment effect assumption). The corresponding variance estimator

$$\hat{V}^c = \frac{N_0}{N_1N} s_1^2 + \frac{N_1}{N_0N} s_0^2 + \frac{2s_1s_0}{N}$$

is a uniform improvement over the traditional Neymanian variance estimator asymptotically. Furthermore, if we use the sharp bounds of $\text{var}(\hat{\tau})$ developed by Robins (1988) and Aronow et al. (2014) for binary and general outcomes, Neyman's test will be even more powerful asymptotically and the paradox will still exist.

6.2. Interval Estimation. Originally, Neyman (1923) proposed an unbiased estimator for the average causal effect τ with a repeated sampling evaluation, which was later developed

into the concept of confidence interval. In order to compare Neyman’s approach with the FRT, we converted the interval estimator into a hypothesis testing procedure. As a dual, we can also invert the FRT for a sequence of null hypotheses to get an interval estimator for τ (Rosenbaum, 2002). For example, we consider the sequence of sharp null hypotheses with constant causal effects:

$$H_0^c(\text{Fisher}) : Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = c, \text{ for all } i.$$

The interval estimator of τ is then obtained by

$$FI = \{c : \text{Fail to reject } H_0^c(\text{Fisher}) \text{ by the FRT}\}.$$

In a recent technical report, Dasgupta et al. (2012) called the interval FI a “fiducial interval”, and found some empirical evidence in 2^K factorial designs that the “fiducial interval” is wider than the Neymanian “conservative” confidence interval. Due to the duality between hypothesis testing and interval estimation, our results about hypothesis testing can partially explain the phenomenon about interval estimation in Dasgupta et al. (2012).

7. Historical Controversy and Modern Discussion. As pointed out by R. A. Fisher, “the actual and physical conduct of an experiment must govern the statistical procedure of its interpretation (Fisher, 1935a, Section II).” Neyman and Fisher both proposed statistical procedures in analysis of randomized experiments, relying on the randomization distribution itself. However, whether Neyman’s null or Fisher’s null makes more sense in practice goes back to the famous Neyman-Fisher controversy in a meeting of the Royal Statistical Society (Fisher, 1935b; Neyman, 1935). Rosenbaum (2002, page 39) gave a very insightful philosophical discussion about the controversy, and Sabbaghi and Rubin (2014) revisited this controversy recently. While the answer may depend on different perspectives of practical problems, we discussed only the consequent paradox of Neymanian and Fisherian testing procedures for their own null hypotheses. Both our numerical examples and asymptotic theory showed that we encounter a serious logical problem in the analysis of randomized experiments, even though both Neyman’s and Fisher’s tests are valid Frequentists’ tests, in the sense of controlling correct type I errors. Our numerical examples and theoretical analysis reach a conclusion different from the classic book by Rosenbaum (2002).

Although we have shown that the FRT is less powerful in many realistic cases, we are not concluding that Neymanian inference trumps Fisherian inference for randomized experiments. First, all our comparison is based on asymptotics under regularity conditions, and the conclusion may not be true with small sample sizes or “irregular” potential outcomes. Therefore, Fisherian inference is still useful for small sample problems and exact inference. Second, our discussion is restricted to the tests that use the difference-in-means statistics. However, the FRT can use any statistic that can capture deviations from the sharp null. For example, when Neyman’s null holds with $N_1 \neq N_0$ and $S_1^2 \neq S_0^2$, Section 3.4 concluded that the FRT has no power against the null using $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ as the test statistic, even though $S_1^2 \neq S_0^2$ implies nonzero individual causal effects. And surprisingly, the FRT is even less powerful than Neyman’s “conservative” test, where the latter has a power smaller than the significance level. However, if we use the variance ratio s_1^2/s_0^2 as the test statistic to capture treatment effect heterogeneity deviating from the sharp null, the FRT is more powerful than Neyman’s test in this circumstance. Therefore, we can avoid the paradox by cleverly choosing the test statistic that can capture the deviation from the sharp null.

APPENDIX: LEMMAS AND PROOFS

LEMMA 1 (Cochran, 1977). The completely randomized treatment assignment $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_N)'$ satisfies $E(T_i) = N_1/N$, $\text{var}(T_i) = N_1N_0/N^2$, and $\text{cov}(T_i, T_j) = -N_1N_0/\{N^2(N-1)\}$. If $c_1, \dots, c_N$ are constants and $\bar{c} = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i/N$, we have

$$E\left(\sum_{i=1}^N T_i c_i\right) = N_1 \bar{c}, \text{ and } \text{var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N T_i c_i\right) = \frac{N_1 N_0}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N (c_i - \bar{c})^2.$$

LEMMA 2 (Finite Population Central Limit Theorem; Hajek, 1960; Lehmann, 1998). Suppose we have a finite population $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ with size N and mean $\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i/N$, and a simple random sample of size n with inclusion indicators $\{I_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Let $\bar{X}_n = \sum_{i=1}^N I_i x_i/n$ be the sample mean. As $N \rightarrow \infty$, if

$$(A.1) \quad \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \bar{x})^2 / N} \text{ is bounded and } \frac{n}{N} \rightarrow c \in (0, 1),$$

we have that

$$\frac{\bar{X}_n - \bar{x}}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\bar{X}_n)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. First, $\hat{\tau}$ has the following representation

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\tau} &= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i Y_i^{obs} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - T_i) Y_i^{obs} \\
 &= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i Y_i(1) - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - T_i) Y_i(0) \\
 (A.2) \quad &= \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \left\{ \frac{Y_i(1)}{N_1} + \frac{Y_i(0)}{N_0} \right\} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(0).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since all the potential outcomes are fixed, we use Lemma 1 to obtain that the mean is

$$E(\hat{\tau}) = \frac{N_1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{Y_i(1)}{N_1} + \frac{Y_i(0)}{N_0} \right\} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(0) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(1) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(0) = \tau,$$

and the variance is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{var}(\hat{\tau}) &= \frac{N_1 N_0}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{Y_i(1)}{N_1} + \frac{Y_i(0)}{N_0} - \frac{\bar{Y}_1}{N_1} - \frac{\bar{Y}_0}{N_0} \right\}^2 \\
 &= \frac{N_1 N_0}{N(N-1)} \left[\frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}_1\}^2 + \frac{1}{N_0^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}_0\}^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \frac{2}{N_1 N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N \{Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}_1\} \{Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}_0\} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Because of the following decomposition based on $2ab = a^2 + b^2 - (a - b)^2$:

$$2\{Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}_1\}\{Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}_0\} = \{Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}_1\}^2 + \{Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}_0\}^2 - \{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}_1 + \bar{Y}_0\}^2,$$

we have $2S_{10} = S_1^2 + S_0^2 - S_\tau^2$, and therefore

$$\text{var}(\hat{\tau}) = \frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_0^2}{N_0} - \frac{S_\tau^2}{N}.$$

Furthermore, $\sum_{i=1}^N T_i \{Y_i(1)/N_1 + Y_i(0)/N_0\} / N_1$ is the mean of a simple random sample from $\{x_i = Y_i(1)/N_1 + Y_i(0)/N_0 : i = 1, \dots, N\}$, and the asymptotic Normality of $\hat{\tau}$ follows from (A.2) and Lemma 2 if $x_i = Y_i(1)/N_1 + Y_i(0)/N_0$ satisfies the condition in (A.1). $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Under Fisher's sharp null, all the potential outcomes are fixed constants with $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) = Y_i^{obs}$. The randomization statistic can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) &= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i Y_i^{obs} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - T_i) Y_i^{obs} \\
 (A.3) \quad &= \frac{N}{N_1 N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i Y_i^{obs} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{obs}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 1, we have

$$E\left\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\right\} = \frac{N}{N_1 N_0} \frac{N_1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{obs} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{obs} = 0,$$

and

$$\text{var}\left\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\right\} = \frac{N}{N_1 N_0 (N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2.$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^N T_i Y_i^{obs} / N_1$ is the mean of a simple random sample from $\{x_i = Y_i^{obs} : 1, \dots, N\}$, the randomization statistic $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs})$ follows a Normal distribution asymptotically by (A.3) and Lemma 2 if $x_i = Y_i^{obs}$ satisfies the condition in (A.1). $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. We have the following variance decomposition for $\mathbf{Y}^{obs}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 \\ = & \sum_{\{i:T_i=1\}} (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_1^{obs} + \bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 + \sum_{\{i:T_i=0\}} (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_0^{obs} + \bar{Y}_0^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 \\ = & \sum_{\{i:T_i=1\}} (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_1^{obs})^2 + N_1 (\bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 + \sum_{\{i:T_i=0\}} (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_0^{obs})^2 + N_0 (\bar{Y}_0^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Ignoring the difference between N and $N-1$ contributes only a higher order term $o_p(N^{-1})$ in the asymptotic analysis. Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) \\ = & N_0^{-1} s_1^2 + N_1^{-1} s_0^2 + N_0^{-1} (\bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 + N_1^{-1} (\bar{Y}_0^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 - N_1^{-1} s_1^2 - N_0^{-1} s_0^2 + o_p(N^{-1}) \\ = & (N_0^{-1} - N_1^{-1}) (s_1^2 - s_0^2) + N_0^{-1} (\bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 + N_1^{-1} (\bar{Y}_0^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 + o_p(N^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{Y}^{obs} = (N_1 \bar{Y}_1^{obs} + N_0 \bar{Y}_0^{obs}) / N$, we have $(\bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 / N_0 = N_0 (\bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}_0^{obs})^2 / N^2$ and $(\bar{Y}_0^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 / N_1 = N_1 (\bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}_0^{obs})^2 / N^2$. It follows that

$$\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = (N_0^{-1} - N_1^{-1}) (s_1^2 - s_0^2) + N^{-1} (\bar{Y}_1^{obs} - \bar{Y}_0^{obs})^2 + o_p(N^{-1}).$$

Replacing the sample quantities $(s_1^2, s_0^2, \bar{Y}_1^{obs}, \bar{Y}_0^{obs})$ by the population quantities $(S_1^2, S_0^2, \bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_0)$ adds only higher order terms $o_p(N^{-1})$, and we eventually have

$$\hat{V}(\text{Fisher}) - \hat{V}(\text{Neyman}) = (N_0^{-1} - N_1^{-1}) (S_1^2 - S_0^2) + N^{-1} (\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0)^2 + o_p(N^{-1}).$$

$\square$

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1. For binary outcomes, the conclusions follow from

$$\begin{aligned} s_t^2 &= \frac{1}{N_t - 1} \sum_{\{i: T_i = t\}} (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}_t^{obs})^2 = \frac{N_t}{N_t - 1} \hat{p}_t (1 - \hat{p}_t), \\ s^2 &= \frac{1}{N - 1} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 = \frac{N}{N - 1} \hat{p} (1 - \hat{p}). \end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF THEOREM 4. The log likelihood function for the linear model in (4.1) is

$$l(\alpha, \beta, \sigma^2) = -\frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi\sigma^2) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \alpha - \beta T_i)^2}{2\sigma^2}.$$

Therefore, the score functions are $\partial l / \partial \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \alpha - \beta T_i) / \sigma^2$, $\partial l / \partial \beta = \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \alpha - \beta T_i) T_i / \sigma^2$, and $\partial l / \partial \sigma^2 = -N / (2\sigma^2) + \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \alpha - \beta T_i)^2 / \{2(\sigma^2)^2\}$. Plugging the MLEs under the null hypothesis with $\beta = 0$, $\tilde{\alpha} = \bar{Y}^{obs}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 / N$ into the score functions, we obtain that only the second component of the score functions is non-zero: $\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \bar{Y}) T_i / \tilde{\sigma}^2 = N_1 N_0 \hat{\tau} / (N \tilde{\sigma}^2)$.

The second order derivatives of the log likelihood function are $\partial^2 l / \partial \alpha^2 = -N / \sigma^2$, $\partial^2 l / \partial \beta^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i^2 / \sigma^2 = -N_1 / \sigma^2$, $\partial^2 l / \partial (\sigma^2)^2 = N / (2\sigma^4) - \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \alpha - \beta T_i)^2 / \sigma^6$, $\partial^2 l / \partial \alpha \partial \beta = -N_1 / \sigma^2$, $\partial^2 l / \partial \alpha \partial \sigma^2 = -\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \alpha - \beta T_i) / \sigma^4$, and $\partial^2 l / \partial \beta \partial \sigma^2 = -\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \alpha - \beta T_i) T_i / \sigma^4$. Therefore, the expected Fisher information matrix is

$$\mathbf{I}_N = \begin{pmatrix} N/\sigma^2 & N_1/\sigma^2 & 0 \\ N_1/\sigma^2 & N_1/\sigma^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & N/(2\sigma^4) \end{pmatrix},$$

with the (2, 2)-th element of $\mathbf{I}_N^{-1}$ being $N\sigma^2 / (N_1 N_0)$. Thus, Rao's score test for $H_0(LM)$ is

$$\left(\frac{N_1 N_0 \hat{\tau}}{N \tilde{\sigma}^2} \right)^2 \frac{N \tilde{\sigma}^2}{N_1 N_0} \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2(1),$$

or equivalently,

$$\hat{\tau} / \sqrt{\frac{N \tilde{\sigma}^2}{N_1 N_0}} = \hat{\tau} / \sqrt{\frac{(N-1)s^2}{N_1 N_0}} = \frac{\hat{\tau}}{\sqrt{\hat{V}_S}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

□

PROOF OF THEOREM 5. It is direct to obtain $E\{\hat{\tau}_1(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = 0$ by symmetry. From Equations (12) and (13) in Dasgupta et al. (2012), we immediately obtain:

$$(A.4) \quad \text{var}\{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{N}\right) s^2,$$

$$(A.5) \quad \text{cov}\{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}_1), \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}_2) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = \frac{1}{N} s^2$$

for all $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathcal{F}_K$ and $\mathbf{z}_1 \neq \mathbf{z}_2$. Therefore, the variance of the test statistic is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{var}\{\hat{\tau}_1(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} \\ &= 2^{-2(K-1)} \mathbf{g}_1' \text{cov}(\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{obs}) \mathbf{g}_1 \\ &= 2^{-2(K-1)} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^J g_{1j}^2 \text{var}\{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}_j) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j' \neq j}^J \text{cov}\{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}_j), \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}_{j'}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} \right\} \\ &= 2^{-2(K-1)} s^2 \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^J g_{1j}^2 \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{N}\right) - \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j' \neq j}^J g_{1j} g_{1j'} \frac{1}{N} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation is due to (A.4) and (A.5). Since $0 = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J g_{1j}\right)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^J g_{1j}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j' \neq j}^J g_{1j} g_{1j'}$, we have $-\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j' \neq j}^J g_{1j} g_{1j'} = \sum_{j=1}^J g_{1j}^2 = J$. Therefore, we can simplify the variance as

$$\text{var}\{\hat{\tau}_1(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}^{obs}) \mid H_0(\text{Fisher})\} = 2^{-2(K-1)} s^2 J / r.$$

□

PROOF OF THEOREM 6. We first observe the following variance decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs})^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \sum_{\{i: W_i(\mathbf{z})=1\}} \{Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) + \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}\}^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \sum_{\{i: W_i(\mathbf{z})=1\}} \{Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z})\}^2 + r \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 &= \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \sum_{\{i: W_i(\mathbf{z})=1\}} \{Y_i^{obs} - \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z})\}^2 + \frac{r}{N-1} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}\}^2 \\ &= \frac{r-1}{N-1} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} s^2(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{r}{N-1} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}\}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} s^2(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{1}{J} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}\}^2 + o_p(r^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where ignoring the difference between N and $N - 1$ and between r and $r - 1$ in the last equation contributes the higher order term. Therefore, we have

$$2^{2(K-1)}r \left\{ \widehat{V}_1(\text{Fisher}) - \widehat{V}_1(\text{Neyman}) \right\} = Js^2 - \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} s^2(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}\}^2 + o_p(r^{-1}).$$

Since $\bar{Y}^{obs} = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z})/2^K$, the formula $\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (x_i - x_j)^2/(2n)$ gives us

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}\}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \sum_{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}')\}^2/2^{K+1}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\widehat{V}_1(\text{Fisher}) - \widehat{V}_1(\text{Neyman}) = \frac{1}{2^{3K-1}r} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_K} \sum_{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{F}_K} \{\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z}')\}^2 + o_p(r^{-1}),$$

which leads to the final conclusion since replacing $\bar{Y}^{obs}(\mathbf{z})$ by $\bar{Y}(\mathbf{z})$ contributes only $o_p(r^{-1})$. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks several professors and Ph.D. students at the Harvard Statistics and Biostatistics departments for their helpful comments and enthusiastic encouragement.

REFERENCES

- ANGRIST, J. D. AND PISCHKE, J. S. (2008). *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton University Press.
- ARONOW, P. M., GREEN, D. P., AND LEE, D. K. K. (2014). Sharp bounds on the variance in randomized experiments. *The Annals of Statistics*. In Press.
- COCHRAN, W. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- DASGUPTA, T., PILLAI, N., AND RUBIN, D. B. (2012). Causal inference from 2^k factorial designs using the potential outcomes model. Technical report available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1211.2481.pdf>
- DAVISON, A. C. (2003). *Statistical Models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- EBERHARDT, K. R. AND FLIGNER, M. A. (1977). A comparison of two tests for equality of two proportions. *The American Statistician* **31**, 151-155.
- FISHER, R. A. (1935a). *The Design of Experiments*, 1st Edition. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- FISHER, R. A. (1935b). Comment on ‘‘Statistical problems in agricultural experimentation’’. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **2**, 154-157, 173.
- FREEDMAN, D. A. (2008). On regression adjustments to experimental data. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **40**, 180-193.

- HAJEK, J. (1960). Limiting distributions in simple random sampling from a finite population. *Publications of Mathematical Institute of Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Series A* **5**, 361-374.
- HINKELMANN, K. AND KEMPTHORNE, O. (2007). *Design and Analysis of Experiments, Volume 1, Introduction to Experimental Design, 2nd Edition*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- HUBER, P. J. (1967). The behavior of maximum likelihood estimates under nonstandard conditions. *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, 221-233. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- IMAI, K. (2008). Variance identification and efficiency analysis in randomized experiments under the matched-pair design. *Statistics in Medicine* **27**, 4857-4873.
- KEMPTHORNE, O. (1955). The randomization theory of experimental inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **50**, 946-967.
- LEHMANN, E. L. (1998). *Elements of Large-Sample Theory*. New York: Springer.
- LIN, W. (2013). Agnostic notes on regression adjustments to experimental data: reexamining Freedman's critique. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **7**, 295-318.
- NEYMAN, J. (1923). On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. Essay on principles (with discussion). Section 9 (translated). *Statistical Science* **5**, 465-480.
- NEYMAN, J. (1935). Statistical problems in agricultural experimentation (with discussion). *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **2**, 107-180.
- ROBBINS, H. (1977). A fundamental question of practical statistics. *The American Statistician* **31**, 97.
- ROBINS, J. M. (1988). Confidence intervals for causal parameters. *Statistics in Medicine* **7**, 773-785.
- ROSENBAUM, P. R. (2002). *Observational Studies*. New York: Springer.
- RUBIN, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology* **66**, 688-701.
- RUBIN, D. B. (1980). Comment on "Randomization analysis of experimental data: the Fisher randomization test" by D. Basu. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **75**, 591-593.
- SABBAGHI, A. AND RUBIN, D. B. (2014). Comments on the Neyman-Fisher controversy and its consequences. To appear in *Statistical Science*, available at http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~sabbaghi/sabbaghi_rubin.pdf
- SCHOCHET, P. (2010). Is regression adjustment supported by the Neyman model for causal inference? *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **140**, 246-259.
- SAMII, C. AND ARONOW, P. M. (2012). On equivalencies between design-based and regression-based variance estimators for randomized experiments. *Statistics and Probability Letters* **82**, 365-370.
- WHITE, H. (1980). A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica* **48**, 817-838.
- WU, C. F. J. AND HAMADA, M. S. (2009). *Experiments: Planning, Analysis, and Optimization*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- YATES, F. (1937). The design and analysis of factorial experiments. *Imperial Bureau of Soil Sciences-Technical*

Communication, No. 35, Harpenden.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
ONE OXFORD STREET,
CAMBRIDGE, 02138 MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.A.
E-MAIL: pengding@fas.harvard.edu